United Nations A/C.1/61/PV.21

General Assembly
Sixty-first session

Official Records

First Committee
21st meeting
Thursday, 26 October 2006, at 3 p.m.
New York

Chairperson: Mrs. Juul ..... (Norway)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Agenda items 82 to 97 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairperson: The Committee will continue to take action on the remaining draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper no. 2, starting with cluster 1, namely, nuclear weapons. After completing action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, namely, conventional weapons, starting with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, followed by draft resolutions contained in clusters 6 and 7.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1 in informal working paper no. 2, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement other than explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions. Before doing so, I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): I have just three things to bring to the Committee's attention. First, informal paper no. 3, which will list the draft resolutions that the Committee will be acting on in our next meeting, will be circulated shortly in this room. It will contain all remaining drafts. Secondly, we still have one oral statement missing that pertains to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.21. I would ask interested delegations to kindly contact the Secretariat tomorrow to find out exactly when — it is most likely going to be sometime tomorrow — the oral statement can be picked up at the Secretariat. Finally, delegations will also be getting document A/C.1/61/CRP.6 at this meeting, which contains the draft outline of work, our timetable and schedule for next year.

In accordance with recent practice, the First Committee will be taking a decision at the last meeting of this year's session. In that decision, we will adopt the programme of work and timetable for next year.

The Chairperson: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement other than explanation of vote or to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. Kahiluoto (Finland): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty". The Acceding Countries Bulgaria and Romania, the Candidate Countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, and the EFTA country Iceland, member of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, align themselves with this declaration.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

06-58712 (E)

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is an essential part of the disarmament and non-proliferation regime, and the EU attaches utmost importance to the entry into force of the CTBT at the earliest possible date.

The European Union continues to call on all States, particularly Annex 2 States, to sign and ratify the Treaty without delay and without conditions. The tenth anniversary of the adoption of the CTBT by the United Nations General Assembly this year reminds us all of the need to redouble our efforts to complete the outstanding ratifications that are required for the entry into force of the Treaty.

The Union believes that the legally binding prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, explosions and all other nuclear explosions, as well as a credible verification regime, are vital. Pending the entry into force of the Treaty, we urge all States to abide by a moratorium and to refrain from any actions that are contrary to the obligations and provisions of the Treaty.

The European Union has strongly condemned the test of a nuclear explosive device by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 9 October 2006. That test, carried out in disregard of appeals from the international community, poses a danger to regional stability and represents a clear threat to international peace and security.

The European Union will implement fully all provisions of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, notably of resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1695 (2006).

The European Union strongly urges the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in compliance with resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1695 (2006), to return immediately to the Six-Party Talks, to work towards expeditious implementation of the Joint Statement of September 2005, in particular to verifiably abandon all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programmes, and to comply with its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which includes submitting all its nuclear activities to International Atomic Energy Agency verification.

The EU further calls on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to sign and ratify the CTBT, to refrain from conducting any further nuclear tests or missile launches and to re-establish its commitments to a moratorium on missile launching. The actions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea add to the risk of proliferation worldwide.

The European Union calls for redoubling of efforts to strengthen all aspects of the international system against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

There is an urgent need for the CTBT finally to enter into force. The EU fully supports the draft resolution under consideration. It has been sponsored by all EU member States.

Mr. Kim Kwang Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea opposes draft resolutions A/C.1/61/L.32 and A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1, since they deal with nuclear tests by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a one-sided and biased manner. As we have repeatedly stressed earlier, the nuclear test by the Democratic People's Republic is an exercise of its legitimate right as a sovereign State, since it is a self-defence countermeasure to protect the sovereignty of the country and the life and security of the people from the intensified nuclear war threat, sanctions and pressures by the United States against the Democratic People's Republic.

These draft resolutions are the height of partiality and immorality in selectively taking up as an issue the exercise by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of its rights to defend the sovereignty of the country, while neglecting the hostile policy of the United States towards it, which is the root cause of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula. The draft resolution will only intensify the confrontation rather than solve the issue.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will therefore vote against these draft resolutions, which do not help at all to solve the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea remains unchanged in its will to denuclearize the Korean peninsula through dialogue and negotiations. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic reiterates its principled position that it will make every possible effort to achieve the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and promote global nuclear disarmament and the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Chairperson: I take it that the statement of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic

of Korea was an explanation of vote before the vote. I will then give the floor to other delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before we proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions' cluster 1: "Nuclear weapons".

As there are none, we will then proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate votes have been requested on the last three words of operative paragraph 5 and on operative paragraph 5 as a whole.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 10th meeting on 10 October 2006. Sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.20, A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add. 1 and 2 thereto. In addition, Liberia has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on the three last words, namely, "and South Asia", in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India, Pakistan.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Burkina Faso, France, Israel, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The last three words of operative paragraph 5 were retained by 160 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 operative paragraph 5 as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20. This vote is on operative paragraph 5 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize,

Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 operative paragraph 5 was retained by 161 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Colombia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 as a whole.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the

former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, India, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20 as a whole was adopted by 168 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairperson: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", was issued on 16 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.32* and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1 and Add.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: the Philippines, Senegal, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, India, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Pakistan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32 was adopted by 168 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegation of Equatorial Guinea advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 10th meeting, on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1* and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.2. In addition, Liberia and Senegal have become sponsors.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Colombia, India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1 was adopted by 175 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.53.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.53, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 18th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.53 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and Add.1.

The Chairperson: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.53 was adopted.

The Chairperson: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Bugallo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): Spain fully supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at and agreed upon by consensus among the States of the region in question. Spain has always unequivocally expressed its support for the objectives of treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, because we understand that they make an important contribution to the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation

regime and to efforts leading to nuclear disarmament. Therefore, our delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, which the Committee has just adopted, is important for the establishment of such zones and for cooperation among them. Indeed, Spain has supported provisions of the draft resolution in the past, voting in favour of its antecedents at the fifty-third and fifty-fourth sessions.

However, on this occasion, the Spanish delegation decided to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, as it has done with respect to similar texts since the fifty-fifth session, in view of the realization of a concept about which my country has always had reservations: the holding of international conferences of States parties and signatories to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in order to support the common objectives envisaged in such treaties, which is referred to in paragraph 8.

In its seventh preambular paragraph, the draft resolution just adopted also refers to the possibility of holding, among other types of exchanges, joint meetings of States parties, signatories and observers to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in order to enhance cooperation among such zones — a concept to which Spain has no objection.

Nevertheless, as has been noted, the text on which the Committee has just voted refers in paragraph 8 to something that my delegation has always understood to be a new concept: an international conference that is qualitatively different and, what is more, means moving away from existing consensus on nuclear-weapon-free zones. In fact, that concept does not appear to be mentioned in any part of the April 1999 report of the Disarmament Commission working group on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among the States of the region concerned (see A/54/42) or in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2000/28) in the paragraphs referring to nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Spain participated actively in both negotiations and is pleased to see that they led to satisfactory, although difficult, consensus. Spain believes that those two documents constitute an adequate foundation and there are no additional political or legal elements that would justify holding such an international conference. Therefore, my delegation was not in a position to endorse the proposal or, consequently, to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Darwish (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", because Syria has always maintained that such an important and sensitive Treaty and the future obligations that it will place on all States must not in any way, shape or form ignore the legitimate concerns of the non-nuclear States, which constitute the large majority of the world's countries. Those States have not been given assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Nor are they being allowed to acquire the advanced peaceful technology that is indispensable for accelerating the pace of their development.

Important and fair-minded commentators on the Treaty all agree that it does not commit the nuclear-weapon States to eliminate their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable time frame or explicitly refer to the illegality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Nor does it reaffirm the need to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in order to put an end to proliferation in all its aspects.

All commentators on the Treaty also agree that the text is limited to a prohibition of nuclear test explosions and does not address laboratory tests or the development of new types of nuclear weapons. They also agree that on-site inspection and verification could open the door to the abuse of certain data provided by national verification systems and to the use of such data for political purposes. The strangest thing about the Treaty is that it allows signatories to take measures against non-signatories, including possible Security Council measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, thus violating the sovereign right of States to adhere or not adhere to the Treaty. The Syrian Arab Republic views such substantive loopholes with grave concern.

Syria firmly rejects the inclusion of Israel on the list of Middle East countries. Israel is the only country there to possess nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; it continues to develop those weapons qualitatively and quantitatively. Israel still refuses to accede to the NPT or to place its nuclear facilities under the monitoring and safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. All of that impedes and threatens efforts to establish a nuclear-

weapon-free zone in the Middle East and subjects the region and the entire world to the risk of an Israeli nuclear threat, without any reaction at the international level.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I wish to say how pleased my delegation is to see you, Madam, presiding over our work. My delegation is taking the floor to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". France decided to lend its support to this draft resolution submitted by Japan on the question of nuclear disarmament. With its vote, my country wished to show its support for States that are considering the issue of nuclear disarmament seriously and in good faith and that are endorsing the text proposed by Japan in growing numbers.

The text of the draft resolution has been revised in its substance and its form, compared to the version of two years ago. It is a solid text that brings up questions of substance, including two that are of particular importance to my country: irreversibility and transparency. France recalls that in its 25 April 2005 Common Position, concerning the 2005 NPT Review Conference, the European Union articulated the application of the principle of irreversibility to guide all nuclear disarmament and arms control measures, as a contribution to the maintenance and strengthening of international peace, security and stability, given those conditions. The European Union Common Position promoted efforts towards transparency which are a voluntary confidence-building measure to help make fresh progress in disarmament.

Our positive vote today does not imply renunciation of that position, which remains the reference for our engagement in those two areas. We would wish that in future our position can be better taken into account. France recalls too that nuclear deterrence remains an essential foundation of its security and that the question of nuclear disarmament in conformity with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is among the elements for general and complete disarmament and cannot be dissociated from analyses of the state of international security and stability.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I wish to make a joint explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". I will be speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, France and the United States.

Last year, as in previous years, our three delegations voted against this draft resolution. We note that the draft resolution's preamble recalls the applicable principles and rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the rights of passage through maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. We welcome the acknowledgment of that important point. We do not want those principles and rules to be affected.

In essence, however, we continue to believe that it is contradictory to propose simultaneously an area that would be composed largely of the high seas and yet to say it would not apply to the high seas. We question, therefore, whether the real goal of this draft resolution is, in fact, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone covering the high seas. We do not believe that this ambiguity has been sufficiently clarified, and for that reason we have voted against the draft resolution again this year.

We would like to emphasize, however, that we attach great importance to the development of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones, which could make an important contribution to regional and global security, provided they are supported by nuclear-weapon States and all States of the region concerned; are subject of appropriate treaties, including general assurances provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency; and were satisfactorily concluded in consultation with the nuclear-weapon States, as set out in the 1999 Disarmament Commission guidelines.

Mr. Roa Arboleda (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation was once again obliged, as it was at the previous session of the First Committee, to abstain, at this sixty-first session, in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", despite Colombia's traditional commitment to nuclear disarmament and control and to monitoring and inspection systems.

The Provisional Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and its Preparatory Committee are aware of the constitutional impediments preventing Colombia from becoming a party to the Treaty. Our arguments have

been made publicly and in a transparent manner over the past six years.

Colombia would like once again to reaffirm its unswerving support for the letter and the spirit of that instrument and its resolve to continue to seek ways of overcoming those constitutional impediments, which relate exclusively to the payment of contributions to the Preparatory Commission before the Treaty's ratification.

My delegation is most appreciative of the interest expressed by certain States with respect to finding a solution to those impediments. We hope that we will be able to ratify this important instrument as soon as possible; that is something to which we truly aspire.

My delegation would like also to express its specific support for operative paragraph 5 of the draft, which is fully in keeping with the content of the press communiqué issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia on 10 October last.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation with respect to two draft resolutions.

Let me turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination to work towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

We are in agreement with the main objective of this draft resolution, which is the call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Indeed, the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is their total elimination.

Last year my delegation, despite some reservations on the text, changed its previous position and voted in favour of this draft resolution in hopes that the text of the draft would be improved this year. However, the text of the current draft just adopted by the Committee is, in our view, not appropriately balanced.

For instance, while the draft refers to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, it is focused on only one issue, namely a fissile material cut-off treaty. However, even the reference to the fissile material cut-off treaty is not consistent with previous agreements reached by Member States on its verifiability and the mandate agreed upon by the Conference on Disarmament in 1995. My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32.

I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" (CTBT).

Since the Islamic Republic of Iran supports a total ban on weapons of mass destruction and their development, in particular nuclear weapons, my delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution. However, prospects for the CTBT's entry into force have faced a serious setback due to the rejection of the ratification process by the United States. It only partially supports the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) Preparatory Commission. Although a nuclear-test moratorium has been declared, some efforts are under way in the United States which put into question its commitment to the moratorium.

Following the adoption of the Nuclear Posture Review, which provides for the development of new types of nuclear weapons, the possible use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, and targeting nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty, millions of dollars have been allocated to reducing the time necessary to resume nuclear tests to 18 months.

The Nuclear Posture Review furthermore recognizes

> "the need for a revitalized nuclear-weapons complex that will be able, if directed, to design, develop, manufacture and certify new warheads in response to new national requirements and maintain readiness to resume underground nuclear testing if required."

Test explosions are a key asset in the design, development and refinement of nuclear weapons, and can also be carried out through either simulated nuclear tests using supercomputers or through subcritical tests.

According to recent reports, the National Nuclear Security Administration promised that:

> "The production of plutonium triggers for current weapons, called pits, would remain limited at about 50 per year. Under the Bush plan, the new plutonium centre could produce 125 pits per year, a number that would satisfy current planning for the 2,200-new-warhead stockpile of the future."

As recommended by the WMD Commission, it should reconsider its position and proceed to ratify the CTBT. Only ratification of the CTBT can offer the prospect of a permanent and legally binding commitment to ending nuclear testing.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like explain its vote on two draft resolutions, A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", and A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), voted in favour of these draft resolutions because of our commitment to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. My country believes that multilateral nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation efforts should be carried out simultaneously under the aegis of the United Nations, with a view to achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Venezuela rejects the carrying out of nuclear tests and at the same time believes that the existence of nuclear weapons poses a threat to the survival of humankind and that their total elimination is the only genuine guarantee against their use or the threat of their use.

We are also opposed to the development of new nuclear weapons and favour the destruction of existing weapons. We are convinced that the most effective way to achieve the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world is for all States without exception to adhere to the multilateral agreements that have been negotiated in the area of nuclear weapons and to respect and implement their provisions. We therefore believe that we should not relent in efforts to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. In that regard, we reaffirm that nuclear-weapon States should implement the 13 practical steps set out in the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. We also believe that it is essential for those States to provide us, the non-nuclear-weapon States, with guarantees against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament considered for action this afternoon under cluster 1. I shall begin with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution recognizes the well-established principle that nuclear-weapon-free zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. However, that principle has not been applied in calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This specific proposal logically has no greater validity than the establishment of similar zones in many other parts of the world, such as East Asia, Western Europe or North America. Our delegation therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole and voted against the last three words of paragraph 5 — "and South Asia" — as well as against paragraph 5 as a whole.

I should like now to turn to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". India shares the basic intent of that draft resolution, namely, the elimination of nuclear weapons. We agree that, as set out in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control is the ultimate objective of States. We also appreciate Japan's commitment to that goal. However, we find that the draft resolution incorporates certain elements that are not acceptable to our delegation, such as the call to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State. Therefore, while agreeing with the basic objective of the draft resolution — that is, the total elimination of nuclear weapons — we were forced to vote against the draft resolution.

Finally, as a country that maintains the friendliest and most fraternal ties with Mongolia, India welcomes the adoption without a vote of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.53, on Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status. We note the many steps that Mongolia has taken to reinforce that status, and that Mongolia has received support and security assurances for that status from Member States, in particular those that possess nuclear

weapons. India fully respects the choice made by Mongolia and is willing to respond, whenever required, with every possible support and commitment to Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

Ms. Rocca (United States of America): I am taking the floor to explain the votes of the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", and draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

The United States considers that, of all the draft resolutions introduced on nuclear disarmament, draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32* is the most balanced and most realistic. In particular, we note its support for compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, its recognition of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions between the United States and Russia, its call for the immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty and its positive reference to International Atomic Energy Agency comprehensive safeguards agreements and the Model Additional Protocol. This year, we applaud the condemnation, in the final preambular paragraph, of the nuclear test by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. At the same time, the United States has continued to vote against this draft resolution and its predecessors because of its support for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in paragraph 9. As representatives are aware, the United States opposes that Treaty.

Those considerations apply as well to the United States vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*. We cannot support a draft resolution supporting the CTBT. Nevertheless, I would like to note our support for the position expressed in paragraph 5, which condemns the nuclear tests by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and demands that that country not conduct further tests.

Mr. Khalilullah (Pakistan): I should like to explain our votes on three draft resolutions under this cluster. I shall start with an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.20, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

Pakistan has always supported the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the regions concerned. However, the call in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia fails to acknowledge the reality on the ground. My delegation would like to recall that for 24 years Pakistan itself sought unsuccessfully to promote that objective in the region. The nuclear explosions in South Asia on 11 and 13 May 1998 disrupted the strategic balance in South Asia, which obliged Pakistan to conduct its tests to restore strategic stability. With those explosions, however, the objective of establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons was defeated. Therefore, the insertion of South Asia into the resolution runs counter to the realities on the ground. Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the vote on paragraph 5, as well as on the resolution on the whole, and voted against the last three words in paragraph 5.

I shall now explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.32*, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". My delegation does not agree with several provisions of the draft resolution. The draft resolution places lopsided emphasis on non-proliferation, rather than on nuclear disarmament. That indeed reflects a regression in this vital area. In accordance with our consistent position, we cannot accept the call to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear-weapon State; nor do we consider ourselves to be bound by any of the provisions that emanate from the NPT Review Conferences or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. While my delegation supports the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, it cannot agree to some of the proposals in the draft resolution, which are both selective and unrealistic.

In view of those reservations, my delegation has abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

I will now explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", contained in document A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*.

Over the years, Pakistan has consistently supported the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). We have been voting in favour of this draft resolution in the Committee. We have voted for the draft resolution this year as well.

In keeping with our policy of restraint and responsibility, Pakistan has observed a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing which we believe is in

line with the object and purpose of the CTBT. We would have liked the draft resolution to appropriately reflect this element.

My delegation continues to believe that the objective of the call in the draft resolution for promoting signatures and ratifications leading to the CTBT's entry into force will be facilitated when major erstwhile proponents of the CTBT decide to restore their support. Acceptance of CTBT obligations on a regional basis in South Asia will also help expedite its entry into force.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

My delegation, while supporting a number of elements contained in this draft resolution concerning the total elimination of nuclear weapons and their non-proliferation, deems it important that the draft resolution reflect all of the norms governing the non-proliferation regime established by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and by the resolution and decisions on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review Conference as well as the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference. The draft resolution should reflect the commitments made by the nuclear-weapon States under article VI of the NPT and the 13 practical steps on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, adopted by consensus in 2000.

My delegation believes also that operative paragraph 11 runs counter to the consensus that emerged in the Disarmament Commission with regard to negotiations on an international effectively verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty. We would like to cooperate with Japan in the coming period to ensure respect and protection for the NPT in a manner consistent with the principles contained in the draft resolution on non-proliferation and disarmament.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on two draft resolutions.

I turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.32, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Over the past few years, the main sponsor of this draft — Japan — has introduced several amendments making the draft resolution before us more balanced. That has enabled my delegation in recent years to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

We support the ultimate objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons in the context of general and complete disarmament. While we cannot support some of the paragraphs in the draft resolution, which differ significantly from Israel's policy, we support other paragraphs, particularly those related to non-proliferation, the crucial importance of the development of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) verification regime, and the condemnation of nuclear testing by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

On the second draft resolution — A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1*, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" — Israel's signature of the CTBT in September 1996 reflected its longstanding policy of bringing itself closer, wherever possible, to international norms on nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation. The importance of the CTBT is especially pronounced in the light of the challenges related to nuclear non-proliferation and the non-compliance that have been so evident in recent years in the Middle East.

The recent nuclear explosion reportedly conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aggravates the situation further and adds to the already existing instability in North-East Asia. Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission of the CTBT in November 1996, Israel has played a major part in various activities aimed at developing all elements of the CTBT verification regime. That demonstrates the importance that Israel attaches to the CTBT, which it views as an important contribution to enhancing international peace and security.

Israel voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.48/Rev.1* in the light of the importance it attaches to the objectives of the CTBT, notwithstanding its reservations regarding operative paragraph 1.

Israel believes that progress remains to be made in the development of the CTBT verification regime, whose completion is a prerequisite for the entry into force of the Treaty, as required by the first paragraph of article IV of the CTBT. The Treaty's verification regime should be robust so as to detect non-compliance with its basic obligations, be immune to abuse, and, at the same time, allow each signatory State to protect its

national security interests. For Israel, completing the verification regime constitutes a major consideration for ratifying the Treaty.

Two other important considerations for ratification include Israel's sovereign equality status in the policy-making organs of the Treaty, including those related to the geographical region of the Middle East and South Asia, and in the Executive Council of the future Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), and adherence to and compliance with the Treaty by States in the Middle East.

We believe that, pending the CTBT's entry into force, the Treaty's advancement calls for the following commitments and activities to be diligently pursued by all States: sustain the commitment not to carry out any nuclear-weapon-test explosions, in line with the Treaty's basic obligation; complete, as soon as possible, the CTBT's verification regime; operate, maintain and test the International Monitoring System (IMS) and the International Data Centre (IDC) prior to their entry into force in order to gain experience and to provide early detection capabilities, and, in addition, where coverage gaps of the (IMS) stations exist, take temporary measures to fill those gaps, such as the operation of auxiliary seismic stations as primary ones until all primary stations are effectively functioning and transferring data; maintain the technical and political nature of the Preparatory Commission's work and respect its rules and procedures; and use IMS and IDC capabilities without detracting from their primary objectives as the verification instruments of the Treaty to support tsunami warning systems in order to alert threatened populations in a timely manner and save human lives.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". I first call on delegations wishing to make general statements regarding this cluster.

Mr. Ogunbanwo (Nigeria): In his address to the General Assembly at the 18th meeting of its present session, on 25 September 2006, President Olusegun Obasanjo took the lead in calling for "a comprehensive and legally binding global arms trade treaty". Today, my delegation wishes to express its satisfaction that an impressive number of countries have stated their support for draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55. We believe that, first and foremost, an arms trade treaty should establish a common standard on arms transfers, regulate the international arms trade and ensure the non-diversion of arms to unauthorized end-users.

In that connection, we urge all Member States to be guided by the example provided by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) when in June this year it adopted the landmark Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials. The Convention contains very far-reaching provisions on international arms transfers, provisions that are not to be found in the existing norms on that issue.

Inter alia, the Convention places a ban on arms transfers into, from and through West Africa. Of greatest significance is the ban placed on the transfer of small arms and light weapons to non-State actors implicated in the recurrent conflicts in West Africa and in the attendant political instability and destruction of infrastructure. A State member of ECOWAS shall be granted exemption from such transfers solely for the purposes of legitimate national defence, security needs or participation in peacekeeping efforts, but these will have to receive certification and approval from other member States.

My delegation looks forward to working with other delegations to ensure the success of the goals of resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

Before concluding, I wish to acknowledge the prominent role played by civil society — in particular the International Action Network on Small Arms — in the campaign for an arms trade treaty, as well as its efforts to reduce armed violence.

The Chairperson: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom): I wish to introduce a technical revision to the translation into French of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". The francophone delegations in this room have brought to the attention of the original authors that the French text contains some implicitly prejudicial language. As colleagues will know, that was not the intention of the authors. We will therefore make a recommendation to the Secretariat in writing to correct that impression, but for the convenience of

delegations, and with apologies for my Churchillian version of this noble language, I shall read out the text of the seventh preambular paragraph as it should read in French: "Réaffirmant le respect qu'elle porte au droit international, notamment au droit des droits de l'homme et au droit international humanitaire, et à la Charte".

The Chairperson: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

Jamaica fully supports the objective of an arms trade treaty, recognizing its purposeful intent and the reality that many regions around the world are grappling with the harrowing effects of the illicit use of small arms and its emergence as a contributing factor to many of the world's ills, including crime, terrorism, internal and external conflict and the displacement of persons, thereby continuing to undermine efforts aimed at peace, reconciliation, safety, security, stability and, ultimately, sustainable development.

Jamaica does not manufacture arms or ammunition. Nevertheless, access to illegal weapons and ammunition and the consequently high levels of gun violence place an unmanageable burden on a country's economic and social structure. This draft resolution thus holds significant interest for us, given its possible far-reaching impact, certainly not as a panacea but, as its title suggests, leading towards a legally binding instrument establishing a comprehensive regime to regulate conventional arms.

Jamaica does not have a fundamental difficulty with the draft resolution. In fact, recent history will reveal that Jamaica, along with other States participating in the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting held in Malta last year, supported calls for the work on such a treaty to begin with the United Nations. It will also be recalled that, earlier in the general debate in the First Committee, Jamaica expressed support for an arms trade treaty. However, Jamaica feels that the draft resolution would have had greater balance and wider scope had it incorporated the following elements.

The second preambular paragraph should have included reference to the 2001 Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, to General Assembly resolution 60/81 of 8 December 2005 and to decision 60/519, by which the Assembly adopted the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons. In addition, the fifth preambular paragraph should have included an element of control over the production, export, import, transfer and re-transfer of conventional weapons, in order to prevent their illicit trafficking or their diversion to unauthorized recipients. Furthermore, Jamaica has no problem with the establishment of a group of experts. However, the question legitimately arises as to whether, procedurally, the group can be established before Member States submit their views and the Secretary-General presents his report to the General Assembly. In that context, we feel that paragraph 2 seems to be somewhat premature.

Notwithstanding the concerns we have expressed, Jamaica will vote in favour of the draft resolution, but thought it necessary to explain our vote in advance.

Mr. Kahiluoto (Finland): I wish to speak, on behalf of the European Union (EU) and the States that have aligned themselves with this statement, regarding draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

The European Union attaches great importance to the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and supports all efforts aimed at its full implementation. The Union is the largest donor of international assistance to efforts to contribute to the objectives of the Programme of Action. In December 2005, the Union adopted an integrated strategy at the level of heads of Government to combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and their ammunition. Our broad-based approach to all issues covered by the Programme of Action, including the International Instrument on marking and tracing, is well known. While the European Union appreciates the work done by the three co-authors of the draft resolution — South Africa, Japan and Colombia — as well as their desire to secure a consensus text, it has yet again been disappointing to us that two modest, yet highly relevant, amendments

proposed by the European Union have not been included.

The EU proposals for two new preambular paragraphs covered two key issues. The first was to take note of the continued exchange of views on national and regional practices and lessons learned relating to national controls on transfers of small arms and light weapons. The second was to encourage, where appropriate, the continued integration of efforts aimed at preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons into relevant national and local plans and strategies.

While we were disappointed with the outcome of the Review Conference this July, negotiations revealed that there was a broad range of support for transfer controls, which would have been part of consensus language if a final document had been agreed upon. The EU noted the considerable flexibility and spirit of compromise that many delegations showed. We also noted that there was wide recognition of the importance and relevance of these issues to the effective implementation of the Programme of Action.

The European Union supports the aims and principles of this draft resolution. It is for that reason that the European Union will vote in favour of it. But we are unable to become a sponsor of a text that does not contain the two key features that have such importance and relevance, not only to the EU but to a wide range of delegations from all regions and perspectives.

We would also like to make the following remarks with regard to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The EU regards the regular global exchange of views regarding the implementation of the Programme of Action as essential to maintaining its momentum. It provides a much needed opportunity for all Member States to take stock of progress and to examine at the global level the actions we have taken nationally and at the regional level. Our view remains firm that such meetings, held on a regular basis, are a part of the Programme of Action. As such, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution under consideration provides a mechanism to set a date for which we can all plan.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms". This is, without a doubt, one of the most innovative and ambitious initiatives introduced in the First Committee in recent years. We are convinced of the good intentions that inspired the sponsors of the draft resolution, and we fully share many of their concerns.

Despite the end of the cold war, the trade in arms has not decreased. Instead, it has grown, as can be seen in the continuous growth in world military expenditures, which now exceed $1 trillion. A single country — the United States — spends as much on weapons as the rest of the world combined, while American companies produce 60 per cent of the armaments sold in the world. Only the thirst for profit and domination by certain States can explain why some oppose minimal controls over arms transfers, such as prohibitions on transfers to non-State actors.

The idea of adopting a treaty on the conventional arms trade entails carrying out a necessarily complex and highly sensitive exercise, given the direct security, political, economic and legal consequences it would have for States. In no way could such an exercise ignore the inherent right of States to legitimate self-defence, and hence their right to manufacture, export, import and possess conventional weapons in order to meet their security needs. Cuba believes that the importance of those rights is not merely a formality. Rather, it is a matter of national security.

For more than 40 years, our country has been subject to an aggressive and hostile policy by the strongest military Power in the world, which possesses the most sophisticated of weaponry, including nuclear weapons. Cuba does not have and never will have weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, conventional weapons are a necessary tool for the defence of our sovereignty and our territorial integrity. We regret the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not make a greater effort to take into account several of the legitimate concerns and constructive proposals made by the Cuban delegation and other delegations during the consultations.

In Cuba's opinion, this initiative must be conceived as a process done in stages. Therefore, we support the idea in operative paragraph 1 of the text, under which States would have the possibility to express their views on this matter. That would be a very useful first step towards more effective actions, with the participation and support of all States.

However, operative paragraph 2 in practice turns operative paragraph 1 into a mere formality without any real usefulness, as it prematurely prejudges the course to be followed, even when States have not had a minimum amount of time to consider the question and express their views and proposals.

Cuba cannot support an approach by which a matter of such importance for States, particularly since it concerns an international legal instrument, is considered by a group of experts. In the United Nations we all know quite well the limitations of those groups: very restricted participation, as decided by the Secretariat without the participation of States, and with the so-called equitable geographical distribution all too often being merely cosmetic. There are many such examples. We believe that operative paragraph 2 is in clear contradiction with the last preambular paragraph of the draft, which indicates the intention to carry out a process of negotiations on a non-discriminatory, transparent and multilateral basis.

We have stressed and will continue to stress the fact that a process such as the one intended in this draft resolution can be universally acceptable and therefore effective only with a guarantee of open and real participation of all States throughout the entire process. It is an issue of interest to us all and one to which we all can and should contribute.

Had the legitimate concerns raised by Cuba and other delegations been taken into account, we are convinced that the draft resolution would have had broader support today, which would have greatly facilitated the future path of this initiative. We hope that, with a view to next year, the sponsors will duly take these considerations into account.

For the reasons just stated, the Cuban delegation will vote in favour neither of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 nor the paragraphs that will be the subject of a separate vote.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reiterates its commitment to general and complete disarmament as an appropriate way of contributing to the strengthening of international peace and security. Nevertheless, my country has decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", as we believe that this initiative has not been sufficiently discussed, given its political, economic and social implications, as well as implications for the security and defence of States. In the opinion of Valenzuela, the initiative should have been dealt with one step at a time.

We believe it indispensable to first have consultations and get the views of all Member States, then to discuss them and finally, on the basis of that exchange of views, to determine whether or not it is appropriate to take action on those issues. The draft resolution prejudges, ab initio, the outcome of an exchange of views on the nature and viability of proceeding to the negotiation of an international treaty on trade in conventional arms and already decides on the establishment of a group of governmental experts as the setting for tackling this issue. We believe that this initiative requires further dialogue and consensus. That is why we have decided to abstain in the vote.

The Chairperson: If there are no other delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, entitled, "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and addenda 1 and 2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Azerbaijan, the Gambia, Liberia, Namibia, Peru and Senegal.

With the permission of the Chair, I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, entitled, "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

"By operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1, the General Assembly would

> '[Decide] that, as stipulated in the Programme of Action, the next biennial meeting of States to consider the national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action, shall be held in New York no later than in 2008;
>
> '[Also decide] that the meeting of States to consider the implementation of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons, shall be held within the framework of the biennial meeting of States'.

"Pursuant to operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the biennial meeting of States would hold one session of a duration of one week, in New York, no later than 2008.

"The conference servicing requirements for the biennial meeting of States is estimated to be $360,700 at current rates. These requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"The attention of the Committee is drawn to provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 172 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 10th meeting, on 10 October 2006. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1 and A/C.1/61/L.47/CRP.5 and addenda 1 and 2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: the Gambia, Liberia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

I will now read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding financial implications that accompanies draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

> "By operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would
>
> > '[Request] the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the next meeting of the States parties and on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the eighth meeting of the States parties as observers'.
>
> "In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next meeting of the States parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating at that meeting, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. The Secretariat will prepare preliminary cost estimates for the next meeting for the approval of States parties, following a planning mission to assess the requirements for conference facilities and services.
>
> "It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating at the meeting.
>
> "Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden,

Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kazakhstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 157 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55. A recorded vote has been requested.

Separate recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/61/L.55 and in A/C.1/61/CRP.5 and the two addenda thereto. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft: Azerbaijan, the Gambia and San Marino.

I should now like to read out for the record the oral statement by the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications that accompany draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

"By operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, the General Assembly would, respectively,

'[Request] the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on the feasibility, scope and draft parameters for a comprehensive, legally binding instrument establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms, and to submit a report on the subject to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session;

'[Request] the Secretary-General to establish a group of governmental experts, on the basis of equitable geographic distribution, commencing in 2008, informed by the report of the Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session, to examine the feasibility, scope and draft parameters for a comprehensive, legally binding instrument establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms, and to transmit the report of the group of experts to the General Assembly for consideration at its sixty-third session;

'[Request] the Secretary-General to provide the group of governmental experts with any assistance and services that may be required for the discharge of its tasks'.

"Implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, 'Disarmament', of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"Pursuant to the request contained in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, it is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold three sessions of one week's duration each in New York in 2008. The conference servicing requirements for the three sessions of the group of governmental experts are estimated to be $549,300. In addition, the non-conference-servicing requirements have been estimated at $431,700, which include travel of experts and the cost of consultants for the substantive servicing of the organizational session of the proposed group of governmental experts in 2008.

"These requirements would be considered in the context of the preparation of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

"The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."

That concludes the oral statement of the Secretary-General that accompanied it.

The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 26 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany,

Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 was retained by 133 votes to 1, with 24 abstentions.

The Chairperson: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sareva (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now taking a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, as a whole, was adopted by 139 votes to 1, with 24 abstentions.

The Chairperson: I will now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions in cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation wishes to state its position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55. China has noted the arms trade initiatives put forward by a number of countries. We are in favour of the international community taking necessary measures to effectively address the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. In that area, the comprehensive implementation of the Plan of Action adopted in July 2001 is of great importance. China is willing to make active efforts in that regard, with all parties concerned.

The legal trade in arms involves the security, defence and economic interests of all countries. The conduct of that trade should be determined primarily by the arms importing and exporting countries themselves. Whether it is necessary to establish common standards or international legal instruments to regulate the arms trade is an extremely complex and sensitive issue. Broad solicitation of the views of all countries, including the major arms-trading Powers, should be followed by serious in-depth discussion of relevant issues. Haste and ill-considered approaches should be avoided.

In view of those considerations, the Chinese delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 tends to prejudge the outcome of the discussions of the United Nations group of governmental experts. Therefore, we were not in a position to support the draft resolution.

I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that the Chinese Government has always followed a prudent and responsible approach to arms exportation and has put in place a strict export control system. It has always complied with the three principles of exports being conducive to the legitimate self-defence of the recipient country; that they cause no harm to the peace, security and stability of the region concerned and the world as a whole; and that they not constitute interference in the internal affairs of the recipient country.

China is also willing to participate actively and constructively in international discussions on issues related to the arms trade, and in work within the framework of the United Nations.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain the Cuban delegation's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". As in previous sessions, the Cuban delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Cuba, which is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons fully shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns that are associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. At the same time, it is well known that for more than four decades my country has been subjected to a policy of continued hostility and aggression by the military super-Power. Cuba is thus unable to renounce its right to the use of such weapons for the preservation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity, in keeping with its right to legitimate self-defence as recognized in the United Nations Charter. We will continue to fully support all efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian and national security issues, are intended to eliminate the terrible impact upon the civilians and economies of many countries of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines.

Mr. Fuls (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I wish to explain the position of our delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.15/Rev.1. This year, as it has in the past on similar texts, Switzerland voted in favour of the draft resolution, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". Contrary to preceding years, we did not join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

My delegation emphasizes the importance of the implementation of the Programme of Action, and of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons.

With respect to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, we wish to recall the follow-up on the Instrument on marking and tracing, as defined in chapter VII of the Instrument (see A/60/88). Paragraph 37 clearly specifies that States will meet on a biennial basis within the framework of the biennial meetings on the Programme of Action, wherever those meetings are

convened. We believe that in principle the meetings would be organized by 2008.

The consensus expressed at last year's World Summit on the links between security, peace, human rights and development must be reflected in common efforts at the international level. Therefore, Switzerland made a specific proposal for a preambular paragraph inspired by the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development. Other delegations made similar proposals. Our delegation continues to support the goals and principles of this draft resolution, while at the same time we regret that our proposal was not taken into consideration.

Mr. Bouchaara (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". The delegation of the Kingdom of Morocco would first like to thank the Australian delegation for the transparency and inclusive character of the consultations that were conducted on this draft resolution.

Morocco is not a signatory of the Convention for vital security reasons related to the defence of our territorial integrity and our legitimate national security interests. As it did during the previous session, however, the Moroccan delegation decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on implementation of the Ottawa Convention. Through this vote in favour of the draft resolution, the Kingdom of Morocco wishes to reiterate its support and devotion to the humanitarian objectives and principles of the Ottawa Convention.

Although not a signatory of the Convention, Morocco would like once again to express its commitment to supporting the review process. Additionally, Morocco voluntarily submitted a report on national measures taken, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Ottawa Convention. We should recall that Morocco has always de facto implemented a number of provisions of the Convention. My country has thus never produced or exported anti-personnel mines. Indeed, long before the Convention entered into force, we ceased to import anti-personnel mines.

Finally, our delegation wishes to emphasize that in 2002 my country ratified Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons regarding mines, booby traps and other devices, which the international community views as an essential instrument in terms of international humanitarian law. Our Accession to Amended Protocol II further demonstrates my country's determination to make a contribution in the struggle against the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has taken the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, on implementation of the Convention on anti-personnel mines and on their destruction — the Mine Ban Convention — and in document A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

I would like to begin with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes the inherent right of all States to self-defence. The fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution acknowledges the right of all States to manufacture, import, export, transfer and retain conventional arms for their self-defence. While engaging in trade in conventional arms, all States are bound to fully comply with arms embargos decided by the Security Council in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, in regulating the export of conventional arms, they are required to take into account their obligations under international law, including the Charter, international human rights law and international humanitarian law, which provide the universally acceptable standards and norms for the conduct of States.

India fully supports measures that would contribute to international peace, security, sustainable development and respect for human rights. We are not, however, convinced that it is the absence of common international standards on trade in conventional arms that is responsible for the irresponsible or illicit trade in conventional arms. In our view, it is the sole responsibility of States to establish firm control over trade in conventional arms, taking fully into account their obligations under both national and international law.

We support the proposal in paragraph 1 to request the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on further measures that may be necessary to establish full national control over trade in

conventional arms. The draft resolution, however, prejudges the outcome of this consultation in requesting the Secretary-General, in paragraph 2, to establish a group of governmental experts. It would be appropriate if such a group were to be established through a resolution to be adopted at the sixty-second session, after taking into account the views expressed by Member States in response to the request contained in paragraph 1. We were therefore constrained to abstain in the votes on paragraphs 2 and 3 and also to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

I now turn briefly to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1. India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of anti-personnel landmines. India's participation in the Nairobi review conference and, since then, in the meetings of the States parties, reflects India's commitment to that vision. India has ratified Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, and has discontinued since 1997 the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and has observed a moratorium on their transfer.

Furthermore, India remains committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance and rehabilitation of mine victims, and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end. India has organized a number of camps in Afghanistan for the provision of prosthetics to victims of landmines in Afghanistan.

India believes that attaining the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines will be facilitated by the availability of effective and non-lethal alternative technologies that can perform, cost effectively, the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines. India supports the approach enshrined in Amended Protocol II, which addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. That is why India is not party to the Mine Ban Convention and abstained on the draft resolution on that subject.

Ms. Low (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Singapore's position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. Singapore supports and will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed against innocent and defenceless civilians. With this in mind, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium in May 1996 on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely. At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly states that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counterproductive.

Singapore supports international efforts to resolve the humanitarian concerns over anti-personnel landmines. We will continue to work with members of the international community towards finding a durable and truly global solution.

Ms. Mu (Myanmar): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Myanmar is resolutely in favour of banning the export, transfer and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines. Although Myanmar is not a State party to the Ottawa Convention, my delegation respects the position of the States parties to the Convention. We oppose the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines, which causes death and injury to innocent people all over the world.

At the same time, Myanmar believes that all States have the right to self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter: all States must possess the right to self-defence, as no State would compromise its national security and sovereign interests under any circumstances. In this regard, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common

international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

The Islamic Republic of Iran, as a country affected by the problem of the illicit trade in arms, which is in Iran's case linked to drug trafficking and operations of terrorist groups from outside the country, has always been supportive of efforts to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in arms. But my country attaches great importance to the issue of transfer control, in order to prevent such illicit trade.

Our approach during the recent regional United Nations Conference on Small Arms in negotiating a compromise text for the transfer control of the draft final document is indicative of the way we approach the issue of arms control.

Throughout the informal consultations held by the sponsors of the current draft resolution, either on a bilateral basis or in informal meetings, my delegation expressed its views and its readiness to engage in constructive cooperation. However, our views have not been reflected in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

In our view, the current draft contains some repetitions and contradictions and lacks a basis for consensus, which is necessary for such a draft resolution. Some of the preambular paragraphs are repetitive. Furthermore, in the operative part, the draft resolution seeks, on one hand, the views of Member States and yet, on the other hand — even before receiving the views of States — it requests the establishment of a group of governmental experts, which seems contradictory and, indeed, prejudges the views of Member States. During the sponsors' consultations, a proposal was made to reconcile this contradiction by pursuing a step-by-step approach. This proposal was supported by many delegations, including my own. Unfortunately, it has not been taken into consideration.

Last but not least, in such an important initiative, all of our major arms-producing countries should be involved; their support is necessary for any future successful instrument. Without the participation of the arms-producing States, even if we achieve such an ambitious goal, the treaty would turn into yet another ineffective instrument; it could also undermine the United Nations Programme of Action, which, in our view, would be a matter of serious concern.

While we will continue to examine the overall effectiveness, or ineffectiveness, of this proposed initiative, for the aforementioned reasons, my delegation has abstained on the draft resolution, at this stage.

Mr. El Hadj Ali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms".

My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution, in accordance with our position of principle calling for the establishment, within the United Nations, of multilateral and transparent legal frameworks having to do not only with conventional weapons but also with all weapons. We, therefore, support any steps that would be taken to establish an international instrument that would define objective norms to regulate the transfer of conventional weapons. This type of instrument should, in our view, be the culmination of a process of multilateral, transparent cooperation as broad-based as possible, among Member States, who are the only ones responsible for implementing the commitments that would be taken at this level. This exercise that we will be engaged in the future must be conducted on a non-selective basis in accordance with international law and the principles set out in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Berbash (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 on behalf of our fraternal Arab countries — Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen — and my own country, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

We have followed with interest the discussions that have taken place over the last few days regarding a draft resolution on the adoption of an international treaty on trade in conventional arms. These discussions have clearly shown that there are still different viewpoints and reservations among many States with respect to the draft resolution. Although we understand the humanitarian objectives and the reasons behind the initiative, we believe that the draft resolution did not take into account a certain number of essential considerations that would help to fine-tune global

mechanisms to monitor arms in a way that would be balanced, non-selective and comprehensive, providing for national security, as well as regional and international security for all States under international law.

While we fully respect the international commitments contained in the final document in the first special session on disarmament and the priority that was given in this document to nuclear disarmament in order to achieve general and complete disarmament, we emphasize that any procedures take for control of arms and for transparency that are selective would not guarantee a balanced and comprehensive viewpoint, one that would allow us to implement the commitment of the international community to achieve full and complete disarmament.

This applies particularly to the situation in the Middle East, where Israel continues to occupy Arab territories and possesses sophisticated weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Israel continues to be the only State in the region that is not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It continues to ignore repeated appeals launched by the international community to accede to the NPT and to submit all its nuclear facilities and systems to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) comprehensive safeguards regime.

We support the call for adopting an approach that would garner the support of all Member States of the Organization to discuss the usefulness of coming up with arrangements regarding arms monitoring and to do so with transparency. We believe that any agreement regarding the usefulness of starting negotiations on these mechanisms and measures must be done by means of open-ended negotiations, within the United Nations and open to all Member States.

While we do not support operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which deals with the establishment of a group of governmental experts, we believe that this measure is pre-emptive and that it prejudges operative paragraph 1, which requests that the Secretary-General seek the views of Member States.

If arms control measures are to achieve regional and international peace and security, they must take into account the security concerns of all countries, without any selectivity. If that were guaranteed equally to all States, they would make a real commitment to the implementation of such measures.

I should now like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47 on implementation of the Ottawa Convention on Landmines. My delegation abstained in the voting on that draft resolution because of our position on the Ottawa Convention, to which we have not yet acceded because it does not take into account our concerns and those of a number of other States that are suffering as a result of such mines. Those concerns were expressed during the meetings of the Preparatory Committee, in which we participated as an observer. Nevertheless, at the national level, my country in coordination with Canada hosted a special mine workshop in Tripoli on 12 May 2005 and established a high-level national body to deal with the problem of mines. A number of United Nations experts on anti-personnel mines also participated in that workshop.

We hope that the concerns that we have expressed will be taken into account in the near future.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We wish to make a brief explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty".

We understand the concern regarding the humanitarian aspects of the issue of the uncontrolled spread of conventional arms throughout the world. We see the illegal arms trade as the heart of the problem. That trade is the main source for illicit armed groups, terrorist organizations, criminal gangs and States and Governments under Security Council embargoes seeking to obtain such weapons.

However, the need for a treaty on the legal arms trade is not obvious. There are already a significant number of arms limitation regimes of various types and in various formats. The issue that we must address is how to implement what we already have. Is there any possibility that we can further strengthen and universalize those instruments in the future?

The draft resolution refers to the field of responsible arms trade. We have several questions: what will the criteria be for a responsible trade, how will one distinguish a responsible trade from an irresponsible trade, and who will do that in practice? That is only one obvious example of how difficult it would be for States to reach agreement on any new universal rules and principles for a legal arms trade.

On many occasions during the preparatory discussions in the First Committee, we expressed our wishes regarding the text of this draft resolution. Unfortunately, most of those comments were not taken into account. We believe that the draft runs counter to the logic in the work on new proposals that has been generally accepted at the United Nations, and elsewhere. We are planning, not just one, but several steps forward at a time when the very advisability of that type of movement has not yet been determined. In other words, we need to obtain information and the views of States regarding the need for a new treaty and the advisability of future steps to be taken in that direction. However, it seems as if matters are being predetermined. We believe that it is unjustified and counterproductive to move forward in that way. Russia is prepared to take into account any proposals made by our partners in future discussions.

Those are some of the concerns that led to our decision to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I am taking the floor to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55, entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty".

Unfortunately, we were forced to listen, in the context of the discussion on an arms trade treaty, to a list of baseless allegations against Israel's security policy and its alleged capability. Those accusations have, of course, nothing to do with an arms trade treaty. The countries represented in the discussion that criticized Israel are unwilling to subject their own arms transfers to any standard whatsoever and are encouraging the illicit trafficking of arms to terrorist organizations. Some previous speakers are especially unhappy about Israel's determination to maintain its ability to defend itself.

Israel's self-defence policy is not a source of concern with regard to global peace. There are other real sources of concern in the Middle East. Our policy should also not be a source of concern for countries in our region that do not have aggressive intentions against my country. If countries that do have such intentions are concerned by Israel's ability to defend itself, it should be seen as a contribution to regional stability.

Israel strongly believes in the importance of high and robust standards for arms control. My country is of the view that the implementation of such standards is vital in the struggle against the transfer of arms to terrorists and to countries incapable of providing relevant assurances that such transfers will not take place from the territory under their control. That having been said, we are not yet convinced that an arms trade treaty can facilitate the reaching of such a goal. Moreover, it could, under certain circumstances, hinder the capacity of countries for self-defence and harm legitimate military trade.

Israel's abstention in the voting on this draft resolution should not be perceived as an objection to the very concept of agreed international standardization and strict implementation on this issue.

Mr. Weisleder (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Costa Rica was a sponsor and promoted and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55 on an arms trade treaty, as a fundamental step in our ongoing quests as a peaceful country without an army, for peace and social development. My delegation pledges to continue working until this process culminates in a comprehensive treaty.

Mr. Choi Hong-ghi (Republic of Korea): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.55. Since we explained our position on this issue during the general debate and the thematic debate on conventional weapons this year, I have no intention of repeating it.

My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, regarding the Ottawa Convention on Landmines.

As we have emphasized on previous occasions, the Republic of Korea fully sympathizes with the spirit and objectives of the Ottawa Convention. We firmly believe that that important Convention plays, and will continue to play, a central role in alleviating the human suffering caused by anti-personnel landmines. However, given the security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are compelled to give priority to our security concerns, and are therefore unable at this point to accede to the Convention. However, we have played a part in the process of regulating anti-personnel landmines, having joined the Convention on Conventional Weapons and its amended Protocol II, in the framework of which we are actively participating in a range of discussions to secure the responsible use of landmines based on a prudent balance between military necessity and humanitarian concerns.

Furthermore, we will continue in our efforts to help those affected by anti-personnel landmines through contributions to the relevant United Nations programmes and United Nations Development Programme Thematic Trust Funds and the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund.

Mr. Qazi (Pakistan): My delegation would like to explain its vote on two draft resolutions under this cluster.

I will start with draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Pakistan's position on the question of anti-personnel landmines is well known. Given our security constraints and the need to guard our long borders, which are not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, it is not possible for Pakistan to agree to demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until such a time as viable alternatives are available. My delegation was therefore constrained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

We are against the irresponsible use of landmines. It is that irresponsible use that has caused so much destruction and misery. We remain committed to ensuring the highest standards of responsibility in the use of those defensive weapons. Pakistan is a party to amended Protocol II of the Conventional Weapons Convention, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts, in order to prevent civilians from falling victim to landmines. We are continuing to implement the Protocol with the greatest earnestness.

Pakistan has been actively participating in various international humanitarian demining operations. We have an excellent record on mine clearance in post-conflict situations. The use of anti-personnel landmines by Pakistan is in accordance with international norms. All minefields are marked and monitored to ensure that civilians keep out of mined areas.

I would now like to explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export, and transfer of conventional arms", contained in document A/C.1/61/L.55.

Pakistan has long been at the forefront of efforts to promote the cause of conventional disarmament and arms control, particularly at the regional and subregional levels, so as to advance international and regional peace and security.

Pakistan shares the long-term objectives that the draft resolution sought to achieve. We believe that a comprehensive approach is required to address the complex issue of conventional arms transfers. Emphasis on supply-side prescriptions and disregard of regional particularities does not advance the shared objectives of regulating arms transfers. At the same time, the draft resolution did not address the question of existing imbalances that impact negatively on regional security and are caused by inequitable policies on the part of certain supplying States.

We are convinced that equal attention and effort should be devoted to balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, especially in regions of tension. The overarching aim of any international arms trade framework must be geared towards the reduction of regional and international tensions, the prevention and resolution of conflicts and disputes, the building and enhancing of confidence and the promotion of disarmament, as well as social and economic development.

As agreed at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility to pursue the process of conventional arms reduction.

We share the view that, given the complexity of the issues, a step-by-step approach is essential, on both on substance and process. On substance, the following factors are important: first, promoting the existing mechanism of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms; secondly, addressing both the supply and demand equations of conventional arms transfers; thirdly, further strengthening national controls on transfers; and, fourthly, evolving subregional and/or regional mechanisms, such as the proposal of Pakistan on a strategic restraint regime in South Asia.

With regard to process, we see merit in calls for a sequential approach in dealing with this issue. In the

first instance, therefore, the Secretary-General should seek the views of Member States. At the second stage, Member States could decide on the question of establishing a group of governmental experts and thereafter formulate an instrument or instruments on conventional arms transfers.

My delegation had hoped that some of the elements that I have outlined would be reflected in the draft resolution. However, the omission of those important considerations, which could have made the draft resolution more balanced, obliged my delegation to abstain. We will, nonetheless, remain fully engaged in the process of consultations and dialogue on this issue. In order for the dialogue to be successful, it is necessary for it to be inclusive, reflecting diverse views on the subject.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/61/L.47/Rev.1, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Egypt abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because we believe that the treaty has many gaps. The Convention does not mention the responsibility of States that lay anti-personnel landmines in other countries and fail in their responsibility to eliminate such weapons. We also feel that this draft resolution does not contain appropriate elements referring to assistance to countries affected by anti-personnel mines. Such mines, planted by other countries, have affected Egypt, which has suffered from the presence of 22 million mines planted by warring armies during World War II. That is why we have abstained on this draft resolution.

The Chairperson: I offer my very warm thanks to our interpreters for tonight's job. It was very good of them.

Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to inform members that at our next meeting the Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions listed in Informal Paper No. 2, starting with cluster 6 entitled "Other disarmament measures and international security". We will also take action on four resolutions ready for action in Informal Paper No. 3. These resolutions are A/C.1/61/L.13, Rev.2, L.44, L.54, Rev.1 and L.38.

May I also convey some very sad news this evening. For everyone who has been involved in working on the Programme of Action on Small Arms, Sarah Meek — one of the leading figures in civil society and very involved in developing the Programme of Action — was killed this morning in a car crash in South Africa. We all share in the mourning of this great loss.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.